REMARKS

Claims 1 to 7 are pending and stand rejected. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1 to 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,493,755 to Hansen. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Claim 1 recites as follows:

A network administration system for triggering commands in response to receipt of status logs generated by network devices and applications, comprising:

means for receiving said status logs and generating higher level logs in response to receipt of at least two different status logs which satisfy predetermined rule sets;

a user interface for programming execution sets of commands in association with predetermined ones of said higher level logs; and

program means for receiving said higher level logs, parsing each of said predetermined ones of said higher level logs to determine their respective sources, and triggering execution of said commands in said execution sets in respect of each of said respective sources. (emphasis added)

Hansen teaches a system for automatic notification of status changes of a device that is connected to a network. The device is monitored for activity and the present state at any time is reported to a network management application. The application executes a notification action when the device activity falls within predetermined criteria, referred to as a notification rule.

In contrast from the features of claim 1, cited reference is completely silent on a "means for receiving said status logs and generating higher level logs in response to receipt of at least two different status logs which satisfy predetermined rule sets. Nor is there any teaching or suggestion of "program means for receiving said higher level logs..."

The Examiner also asserts that "means for receiving said status logs and generating higher level logs in response to receipt of at least two different status logs which satisfy predetermined rule sets" is taught at column 4, lines 20 to 24. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited portion of Hansen states "Specifically, an administrator 20 is able to configure the notification function provided by the management software to limit notification, or device status reporting, to only those instances in which a network event occurs." A network event is described beginning at line 24 of column 4 as "a network event represents a change in status of a device being monitored". The cited portion of Hansen further states that "Therefore, the administrator 20 is able to request the network management software 14 to execute a notification action only when a preselected event occurs."

From column 4, it is very clear that the status of network devices is monitored. A network event is considered a change in the status of a network device. When a status change (or network event) is detected, a notification action is executed if that status change falls within a predetermined criteria.

However, the Examiner has ignored certain elements of claim 1. For example, the status logs referred to in claim 1 of the present application are logs that could indicate a change in status of particular devices on the network. This is similar to the device status change indicated in the cited reference. Thus, a log is generated with the change in status of a device being monitored. The recitation of higher level logs in response to receipt of at least two different status logs is not taught in Hansen.

The Examiner also cited column 6, lines 54-65 of Hansen. This portion of Hansen refers to a notification rule which is set using a previous "event" relating to a particular device. The previous event allows portions of the software for defining the notification, to be automatically filled in. It is also contemplated that the same notification rule can be used for any set of devices (the example given is routers). Thus, if a status change in any one of those devices falls within the predefined status change criteria, a notification, defined by the notification rule, is executed. This is in no way equivalent to two different status logs being received and a higher level log being generated in response. Quite clearly, the Examiner is adding to the teachings of the cited reference in order to arrive at the presently claimed invention.

The only other time anything resembling a log is referred to in Hansen is at column 4, beginning at line 39, where it is disclosed that one of the actions defined by the notification rule can be "logging event messages to a network log". Again, the reference specifically states in column 4 that events are changes in status of a network device. Thus, when the change in status occurs, the status is

4

logged in an event log. This is also not the same or equivalent to the generation of a higher level log in response to receipt of two different status logs. It is therefore believed that claim 1 fully distinguishes over Hansen. Similarly, claim 4 is distinguished from Hansen for the same reasons.

The Examiner asserted that claim 6 is taught at column 4, lines 39-45. Claim 6 of the present application includes the recitation of "wherein said means for receiving said status logs and generating higher level logs includes means for generating further higher level logs in response to receipt of at least one of:

a) at least two different higher level logs; and

b) at least one higher level log and at least one status log."

Nowhere in the cited column 4, lines 39-45, nor anywhere else in Hansen is taught or suggested the above cited features of claim 6. This portion of Hansen teaches only the logging of an event message to a network log. In other words, a log is kept. There is absolutely no teaching of generating further higher level logs in response to receipt of at least one of at least two different higher level logs, and at least one higher level log and at least one status log. Therefore, claim 6 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of Hansen. Claims 2-3, 5, and 7 depend upon claims 1, 4, and 6, respectively. The dependent claims are believed allowable for the same reasons as given for the independent claims.

For the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the present application including claims 1 to 7 is in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Frank Chau
Registration No. 34,136
Attorney for Applicants

Correspondence Address:

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
Telephone: (516) 692-8888
Facsimile: (516) 692-8889